

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MARGARET MABLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
WASHINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-2329RAJ

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the court on review of the complaint of Plaintiff Margaret Mable. She is proceeding in this case without the assistance of an attorney and in forma pauperis. In a case where a plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, the court “shall dismiss the case” if it determines that the plaintiff’s complaint either “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Ms. Mable complaint names this District Court, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, and two assistant United States attorneys. She claims errors and double jeopardy arising from a criminal prosecution that she never identifies, violation of unspecified civil and constitutional rights, and violation of “FIOA.” (The court assumes that Plaintiff means to invoke the Freedom of Information Act.)

1 The only factual allegation of her complaint that the court can partially understand  
2 is that one or more of the prosecutors used black marker on discovery that she apparently  
3 requested. The court has no idea in what case the prosecutors allegedly took these  
4 actions. Her complaint, as it currently stands, states no comprehensible allegation of  
5 unlawful activity by the prosecutors, and thus no claim on which the court could grant  
6 relief. The court notes, moreover, that prosecutors are absolutely immune from civil  
7 liability for actions taken in initiating a prosecution and in presenting a case. *Imbler v.*  
8 *Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 431 (1976).

9 The court has no idea why Ms. Mable has named two federal district courts as  
10 Defendants. There is no allegation of what the courts have done to her. She states no  
11 claim against the courts which the court could grant relief. The court notes also that  
12 individual judges of those courts are absolutely immune from civil liability. *Mireles v.*  
13 *Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 9 (1991).

14 Accordingly, the court orders Ms. Mable to show cause why the court should not  
15 dismiss this case for both failure to state a claim and failure to name any defendant who  
16 is not immune from civil liability. Ms. Mable must respond to this order to show cause  
17 by submitting an amended complaint no later than February 7, 2013. That complaint  
18 must contain allegations about Mr. Mable that address the concerns the court raised in  
19 this order. If Ms. Mable does not respond to this order to show cause, or if her amended  
20 complaint does not address all of the issues the court raised in this order, the court will  
21 dismiss this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

22 DATED this 9th day of January, 2014.

23  
24 

25 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
26 United States District Court Judge